arXiv:0712.0085v2 [gr-qc] 6 Aug 2008

On some global problems in the tetrad approach to quasi-local quantities

László B Szabados
Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics
H-1525 Budapest 114, P. O. Box 49, Hungary
e-mail: lbszab@rmki.kfki.hu

August 6, 2008

Abstract

The potential global topological obstructions to the tetrad approach to finding the quasi-local conserved quantities, associated with closed, orientable spacelike 2-surfaces $\mathcal{S}$, are investigated. First we show that the Lorentz frame bundle is always globally trivializable over an open neighbourhood U of any such $\mathcal{S}$ if an open neighbourhood of $\mathcal{S}$ is space and time orientable, and hence a globally trivializable $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ spin frame bundle can also be introduced over U. Then it is shown that all the spin frames belonging to the same spinor structure on $\mathcal{S}$ have always the same homotopy class. On the other hand, on a 2-surface with genus g there are 2^{2g} homotopically different Lorentz frame fields, and there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between these homotopy classes and the different $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ spinor structures.

1 Introduction

It is known that, just because of the complete diffeomorphism invariance of the theory, finding the appropriate *notion* of energy-momentum and angular momentum of gravitating systems in general relativity is highly non-trivial. (For a recent review see e.g. [1].) One possible approach to finding them is based on the tetrad formulation of GR. (Though the basic idea of using tetrad fields already appeared even in the early 1950s, the first who systematically investigated the conserved quantities in this formalism was probably Møller [2]. This formalism has a long history with extended bibliography, in which many of the classical results are rediscovered from time to time. However, instead of giving a complete bibliography of the field, we refer only to the reviews [3, 4]. Some of the huge number of papers using tetrad formalism and giving an extended list of references are [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].)

In this approach the basic field variable is the (for the sake of simplicity, orthonormal) vector basis (or tetrad field) $\{E^a_{\underline{a}}\}$, $\underline{a} = 0, ..., 3$. The advantage of this approach is that although the standard expression for the contravariant form $\tau^{\alpha\beta}$ of the canonical energy-momentum, derived from Møller's Lagrangian in some local coordinate system $\{x^\alpha\}$, is only *pseudotensorial*, the canonical spin $\sigma^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ and the canonical Noether current, built from $\tau^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\sigma^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ as

$$C^\mu\bigl[K\bigr] := \tau^{\mu\beta}K_\beta + \Bigl(\sigma^{\mu[\alpha\beta]} + \sigma^{\alpha[\beta\mu]} + \sigma^{\beta[\alpha\mu]}\Bigr)\partial_\alpha K_\beta \tag{1.1}$$

with any vector field K^a, are independent of the actual coordinate system, i.e. they are *tensorial* [8, 9]. This current can be derived from a superpotential $\vee_e{}^{ab}$ through $\kappa C^a[K] - G^{ab}K_b = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_b(K^e \vee_e{}^{ab})$, which is also tensorial and is known as Møller's superpotential [2, 3]. (Here $\kappa := 8\pi G$ with Newton's gravitational constant G, and we use the conventions in which Einstein's equations take the form $G_{ab} = -\kappa T_{ab}$.) Moreover, the tensorial nature of $\vee_e{}^{ab}$ makes it possible to introduce a *tensorial* energy-momentum too [8, 9]. Nevertheless, the final expressions still *do* depend on the actual choice of the tetrad field.

However, there is another (and always overlooked) potential difficulty in this approach. Namely, the basic field variable is defined only on an open subset $U \subset M$ of the spacetime manifold, e.g. when U is contractible, but in general such a U cannot be extended to the whole M. Thus though the current $C^a[K]$ is a genuine vector field, it is defined only on the domain of the tetrad fields. The obstruction to the globality of such a tetrad field is the global non-triviality of the orthonormal frame bundle $B(M, O(1,3))$ over the spacetime manifold. Since in general this bundle is *not* trivial, the resulting expression for the gravitational energy-momentum density has the extra limitation that it is defined only on the local trivialization domains of the frame bundle.

Instead of the orthonormal frames we could use normalized spin frames $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$, $\underline{A} = 0, 1$, too (see e.g. [5, 13]). Let us consider the orthonormal frame field to be built from the spin frame, $E^a_{\underline{a}} = \sigma_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{A}\,\underline{A}'}\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{A'}_{\underline{A}'}$, where $\sigma_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{A}\,\underline{A}'}$ are the standard $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ Pauli matrices divided by $\sqrt{2}$ (see e.g. [14]). Then, combining results of [13] and of [8, 9, 1], for the dual of Møller's tensorial superpotential we obtain the following remarkable expression

$$\frac{1}{4}\sigma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{A}\,\underline{B}'}E^e_{\underline{a}} \vee_e{}^{ab}\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{abcd} = u\bigl(\mathcal{E}_{\underline{A}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\underline{B}'}\bigr)_{cd} + \overline{u\bigl(\mathcal{E}_{\underline{B}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\underline{A}'}\bigr)_{cd}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where overline denotes complex conjugation and $u(\lambda, \bar{\mu})_{cd} := \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}(\bar{\mu}_{C'}\nabla_{DD'}\lambda_C - \bar{\mu}_{D'}\nabla_{CC'}\lambda_D)$ is known as the $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ spinor form of the Nester–Witten 2-form. However, the use of spinors does not improve the frame dependence of the local energy-momentum expressions: the superpotential (1.2) still depends essentially on the actual spin frame. Indeed, as in the previous paragraph, it is defined only in the local trivialization domains of the spin frame bundle. Moreover, in the spinor approach, first we would have to ensure the existence of spinors (in the form of a spinor structure).

This difficulty is more manifest if we want to associate the conserved quantities with *extended* domains of spacetime, i.e. when they are intended to be introduced globally or quasi-locally [1]. In particular, the tensorial superpotential for the canonical Noether current (1.1), i.e. the 2-form $K^e\frac{1}{4} \vee_e{}^{ab}\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{abcd}$, could be integrated on a closed, orientable spacelike 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ to obtain a potentially reasonable quasi-local energy-momentum and angular momentum expression *only if $\mathcal{S}$ is in a local trivialization domain of the frame bundle.* However, it is not a priori obvious that any such 2-surface is in a trivialization domain, e.g. when $\mathcal{S}$ has large genus or surrounds some spacetime singularity (and, in particular, when it is not the boundary of some compact subset of M, and hence it is not contractible). If it were, then equation (1.2) would yield a *natural Lagrangian interpretation to all the quasi-local energy-momentum expressions that are based on the Nester–Witten 2-form*: they are charge integrals of Noether currents derived from Møller's tetrad Lagrangian.

For the *global* trivializability of $B(M, O(1,3))$ over the whole spacetime manifold M Geroch gave necessary and sufficient conditions [15]: (M, g_{ab}) must admit a spinor structure, which condition in a time and space orientable spacetime is known to be equivalent to the vanishing of the second Stiefel–Whitney class of M [16, 17, 14]. (For a number of sufficient conditions of the existence of a spinor structure, e.g. the global hyperbolicity, see [18].) However, from the point of view of quasi-local quantities it would be enough if we could ensure that the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ is in *some* local trivialization domain of the Lorentz or spin frame bundles, independently of the global topological properties of subsets of M that are 'far' from our 2-surface. Thus now we are interested only in the "quasi-local trivializability" of the frame bundle $B(M, O(1,3))$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is in such a domain, then the next question is how to choose the global frame field. The frame should not be fixed, constant basis (or gauge) transformations must be allowed. A remarkable property of the integral of the superpotential 2-form $K^e \frac{1}{4} \vee_e{}^{ab} \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abcd}$ on $\mathcal{S}$ is that it depends *only on the value of the tetrad field on $\mathcal{S}$, but independent of the way in which it is extended off the 2-surface.* In particular, it is an algebraic expression of K^a and the tetrad field and its first derivative *tangential* to $\mathcal{S}$. Thus we need a *gauge condition*, e.g. in the form of a system of linear partial differential equations *only on $\mathcal{S}$*, admitting a six parameter family of solutions, and yielding the rotational freedom of the constant orthonormal basis of Minkowski spacetime. Therefore, it is natural to expect that the gauge condition, as a differential equation, is built up *only from the intrinsic and extrinsic geometry of the 2-surface.*

The general strategy to prove the existence of its solutions could be to search for the 'preferred' frame in the form $E^a_{\underline{a}} = {}_0E^a_{\underline{b}} \Lambda^{\underline{b}}{}_{\underline{a}}$, where $\{{}_0E^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ is a fixed frame field and $\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \to SO_0(1,3)$, a space and time orientation preserving Lorentz matrix valued function on $\mathcal{S}$. The calculations would be simpler if we could write $\Lambda^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{b}} = \exp(\lambda)^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{b}} := \delta^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{b}} + \lambda^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{b}} + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{c}}\lambda^{\underline{c}}{}_{\underline{b}} + ...$ for some $so(1,3)$ Lie algebra valued function $\lambda : \mathcal{S} \to so(1,3)$. However, this can be done precisely *when the homotopy class of the frame fields $\{{}_0E^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ and $\{E^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ is the same*, e.g. when every continuous map $\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \to SO_0(1,3)$ is homotopic to the identity transformation. (Here $SO_0(1,3)$ denotes the connected component of the Lorentz group $O(1,3)$.)

If we use spinors then there is the additional difficulty that there might be different spinor structures. Then the 'preferred' spin frame field can be written as $\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}} = {}_0\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{B}} A^{\underline{B}}{}_{\underline{A}}$ for some given spin frame field $\{{}_0\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and gauge transformation $A^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}} = \exp(a)^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}} := \delta^{\underline{A}}_{\underline{B}} + a^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}} + \frac{1}{2} a^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{C}} a^{\underline{C}}{}_{\underline{B}} + ...$ with some $a : \mathcal{S} \to sl(2, \mathbb{C})$ precisely when the spin frames $\{{}_0\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ belong to the *same* spinor structure and have the same homotopy class. Thus we should know the different $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ spinor structures and the homotopy classes of the global Lorentz and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ spin frame fields (or, equivalently, of the Lorentz and spin gauge transformations) on $\mathcal{S}$.

The aim of the present paper is to clarify the specific global problems raised in the previous paragraphs. In particular, we want to find the conditions under which the quasi-local conserved quantities can be introduced in the tetrad formalism of general relativity even without imposing all the usual *global* topological restrictions on the *whole* spacetime. We will show that an orientable closed spacelike 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ is always contained in a trivialization domain U of the orthonormal frame bundle if at least an open neighbourhood of $\mathcal{S}$ is space and time orientable, and hence a trivializable spin frame bundle can also be introduced over U. Thus the 'quasi-local trivializability' of the Lorentz frame bundle is ensured by the orientabilities: in addition to the orientability of the 2-surface and the time and space orientability of *some* open neighbourhood of the 2-surface *no* extra global topological restriction is needed (in contrast to the global trivializability of the frame bundles over the *whole* spacetime manifold). In particular, in the tetrad approach to general relativity the quasi-local conserved quantities may be associated with a given 2-surface even if the Lorentz frame bundle is not globally trivializable over the whole spacetime manifold (an example for such a space and time orientable spacetime is given in [19]), or even if the spacetime is not globally space and time orientable. We clarify the homotopy classes of the globally defined Lorentz and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ gauge transformations on $\mathcal{S}$ too. We find that in a given spinor structure there is always one homotopy class of the spin gauge transformations. However, on surfaces with genus g, there are 2^{2g} different homotopy classes of the Lorentz gauge transformations, and these are in a natural one-to-one correspondence with the different $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ spinor structures. Thus, in the construction of the quasi-local conserved quantities on topological 2-spheres in the tetrad formalism none of the obstructions above can occur, and both the 'preferred' spin and Lorentz frames can always be searched for in the form $\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}} = {}_0\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{B}} \exp(a)^{\underline{B}}{}_{\underline{A}}$ and $E^a_{\underline{a}} = {}_0E^a_{\underline{b}} \exp(\lambda)^{\underline{b}}{}_{\underline{a}}$, respectively, even for any fixed ${}_0\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{B}}$ and ${}_0E^a_{\underline{b}}$ and some $a : \mathcal{S} \to sl(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\lambda : \mathcal{S} \to so(1, 3)$. On the other hand, for higher genus ($g \geq 1$) surfaces a choice for the spinor structure, or, equivalently, for the homotopy class of the Lorentz frame field, must also be made. This choice should be a part of the gauge condition.

In the next section we recall some known facts about the global properties of closed orientable 2-surfaces $\mathcal{S}$ that we need in what follows, and briefly discuss the normal bundle of such spacelike 2-surfaces in M. Then, in section 3, the global trivializability of the Lorentz and spin frame bundles over an open neighbourhood U of arbitrary closed, orientable spacelike 2-surfaces is proven. Finally, in section 4, the homotopy classes of the global frame fields, or, equivalently, of the global spin and Lorentz basis transformations on these 2-surfaces are determined.

Here we adopt the abstract index formalism of [14], and only underlined indices take numerical values. Our basic differential geometric reference is [20], and we use the terminology of [21] in homotopy theory.

2 Closed spacelike 2-surfaces

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a closed, orientable two-dimensional smooth manifold, and let g denote its genus. Since the geometry of the different connected components of $\mathcal{S}$ are independent of each other, for the sake of simplicity (and without loss of generality) we assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is connected.

If $g \geq 1$, then let $\{a_i, b_i\}$, $i = 1, ..., g$, be a canonical homology basis on $\mathcal{S}$; i.e. they are closed, homotopically inequivalent noncontractible curves on $\mathcal{S}$. Then the fundamental group of $\mathcal{S}$ is $\pi_1(\mathcal{S}) = \langle a_i, b_i | \prod_{i=1}^{g} a_i \cdot b_i \cdot a_i^{-1} \cdot b_i^{-1} = 1 \rangle$; i.e. $\pi_1(\mathcal{S})$ is generated by the $2g$ elements a_i, b_i with the only relation that the product of all the commutants $a_i \cdot b_i \cdot a_i^{-1} \cdot b_i^{-1}$ is homotopically trivial. (Here $a \cdot b$ denotes the composition of the closed curves a and b in the sense of homotopy theory, and 1 is the identity element of the fundamental group, being represented by a closed curve in $\mathcal{S}$ homotopic to a point.) Since the first homology group (with integer coefficients), $H_1(\mathcal{S})$, is the abelianization of $\pi_1(\mathcal{S})$, the form of its general element in additive notation is $\sum_{i=1}^{g}(m^i a_i + n^i b_i)$ for some $m^i, n^i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then any group homomorphism $\phi : H_1(\mathcal{S}) \to \mathbb{Z}_2$ is characterized completely by the values $\phi(a_i)$ and $\phi(b_i)$. Therefore, the cohomology group $H^1(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathrm{Hom}(H_1(\mathcal{S}), \mathbb{Z}_2)$, consisting of all the group homomorphisms of $H_1(\mathcal{S})$ into $\mathbb{Z}_2$, has 2^{2g} elements [22].

Next suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ is embedded as a smooth spacelike submanifold in the Lorentzian spacetime manifold M. Let t^a and v^a be timelike and spacelike unit normals to $\mathcal{S}$, respectively, satisfying $t^a v_a = 0$. Obviously, these unit normals are not unique, since there is a gauge freedom $(t^a, v^a) \mapsto (t^a \cosh u + v^a \sinh u, t^a \sinh u + v^a \cosh u)$ for any function $u : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$. However, $\Pi^a_b := \delta^a_b - t^a t_b + v^a v_b$ is well defined: it is the orthogonal projection to $\mathcal{S}$ (by means of which e.g. the induced metric is defined as $q_{ab} := \Pi^c_a \Pi^d_b g_{cd}$).

Theorem 2.1 *If $\mathcal{S}$ is orientable and an open neighbourhood of $\mathcal{S}$ in M is time and space orientable (which we assume in what follows), then the unit normals t^a and v^a can (and, in the present paper, will) be chosen to be globally well defined on $\mathcal{S}$ with future pointing t^a and (whenever defined) outward pointing v^a.*

Proof: Let $W \subset M$ be an open neighbourhood of $\mathcal{S}$ which is time and space orientable. Then the existence of a globally defined timelike normal t^a follows directly from the time orientability of W. By the orientability of $\mathcal{S}$ there is a nowhere vanishing area 2-form ε_{ab} on $\mathcal{S}$, and from the time and space orientability of W its orientability, and hence the existence of a nowhere vanishing volume 4-form ε_{abcd} on W, follows. Then $v^a := \pm\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^a{}_{bcd} t^b \varepsilon^{cd}$, depending on the choice of the orientation, is the desired globally defined spacelike normal. $\Box$

A simple consequence of this theorem is that an open neighbourhood $U \subset M$ of $\mathcal{S}$ can be foliated by smooth spacelike hypersurfaces Σ_t, $t \in (-\tau, \tau)$ for some $\tau > 0$, such that the leaves of this foliation are homeomorphic to $\mathcal{S} \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$, and $\mathcal{S}$ is embedded in Σ_0 as $(\mathcal{S}, 0)$. Hence U is homeomorphic to $\mathcal{S} \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \times (-\tau, \tau)$, and thus its homotopy retract is $\mathcal{S}$.

By Theorem 2.1 the normal bundle $N\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is globally trivializable, and this trivialization is provided by the globally defined normals $\{t^a, v^a\}$. $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$, the restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ of the tangent bundle TM of M, has a g_{ab}-orthogonal global decomposition: it is the direct sum of the tangent and normal bundles of the 2-surface, $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S}) = T\mathcal{S} \oplus N\mathcal{S}$. In the next section we will see that $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$ is also globally trivializable, but this does *not* imply that the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{S}$ is also globally trivializable unless $\mathcal{S}$ is a torus.

The triple $(\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S}), g_{ab}, \Pi^a_b)$ will be called the Lorentzian vector bundle over $\mathcal{S}$. The bundle of frames adapted to $\mathcal{S}$, i.e. the set of the orthonormal frames $\{e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$, where e^a_1 and e^a_2 are tangent, while e^a_0 and e^a_3 are orthogonal to $\mathcal{S}$, is an $SO(2) \times SO(1,1)$ principal fibre bundle, and is *not* globally trivializable in general. Its double covering spin frame bundle is just the GHP frame bundle with the structure group $GL(1, \mathbb{C})$. For some of its global properties see [23].

3 The triviality of the Lorentz and spin frame bundles over a neighbourhood of $\mathcal{S}$

By our assumption an open neighbourhood $W \subset M$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is space and time orientable, and hence the restriction $B(W, O(1,3))$ of the orthonormal frame bundle $B(M, O(1,3))$ to W is reducible to its subbundle $B(W, SO_0(1,3))$. By the next proposition its restriction to an appropriate open neighbourhood $U \subset W$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is isomorphic to a product bundle:

Theorem 3.1 *There exists an open neighbourhood $U \subset M$ of $\mathcal{S}$ such that the principal fibre bundle $B(U, SO_0(1,3))$ is globally trivializable over U.*

Proof: By the first consequence of Theorem 2.1 $\mathcal{S}$ has an open neighbourhood U which is foliated by smooth spacelike hypersurfaces Σ_t, and let t^a denote their future pointing unit timelike normal. Since any orientable 3-manifold is parallelizable [24] (see also [21]), there exists a globally defined orthonormal triad field $\{E^a_1, E^a_2, E^a_3\}$ on Σ_0. Extending this triad field along the integral curves of the timelike normal vector field t^a in some smooth way to the other leaves of the foliation, $\{t^a, E^a_1, E^a_2, E^a_3\}$ provides a global trivialization of $B(U, SO_0(1,3))$ on U. □

Therefore, on some open space and time orientable neighbourhood of every closed, orientable 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ the canonical Noether current and the corresponding tensorial superpotential are always well defined.

The trivializability of $B(U, SO_0(1,3))$ implies the existence of a globally trivializable principal fibre bundle $\tilde{B}(U, SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ and a base point preserving surjective 2–1 bundle map $E : \tilde{B}(U, SL(2,\mathbb{C})) \to B(U, SO_0(1,3))$ taking the right action of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ on $\tilde{B}(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ to the right action of $SO_0(1,3)$ on $B(U,SO_0(1,3))$. Thus E defines a spinor structure on the tangent bundle TU of U, considered to be a spacetime manifold on its own right. Nevertheless, in general there might be other, inequivalent spinor structures on TU, labeled by the elements of the cohomology group $H^1(U,\mathbb{Z}_2)=H^1(\mathcal{S},\mathbb{Z}_2)$. Hence the number of the inequivalent spinor structures on TU is 2^{2g}. By the next statement, however, the corresponding spin frame bundles as abstract principle fibre bundles over U are all isomorphic to the trivial one.

Theorem 3.2 *Any $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ principal fibre bundle over U is globally trivializable.*

Proof: First we show that any $SU(2)$ principal bundle over U is globally trivializable. Thus let $B(U,SU(2))$ be any such bundle, let Σ_t be a foliation of U by smooth spacelike hypersurfaces, and let ξ^a be a vector field on U such that ξ^a is nowhere tangent to the leaves Σ_t and the corresponding local 1-parameter family ϕ_t of diffeomorphisms maps the leaves of the foliation to leaves. Then, using this ϕ_t, every point of U can be represented by a pair (t,p), where $p\in\Sigma_0$. It is known (see problem 18 of lecture 4 in [25]) that every $SU(2)$-bundle over an orientable 3-manifold is globally trivializable, and hence admits a global cross section. (For a proof of this trivializability, using the triangulability of Σ_0, the arcwise connectedness of $SU(2)$ and that $\pi_1(SU(2))=0$ and $\pi_2(SU(2))=0$, see §29 of [21].) Thus let $B(\Sigma_0,SU(2))$ be the restriction of $B(U,SU(2))$ to Σ_0, and let $\sigma_0:\Sigma_0\to B(\Sigma_0,SU(2))$ be a global cross section. Then $\sigma:U\to B(U,SU(2)):(t,p)\mapsto\sigma_0(p)$ is a global cross section of $B(U,SU(2))$, i.e. the bundle $B(U,SU(2))$ is trivializable over U. However, this implies the global trivializability of any principal fibre bundle $B(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ too, because any global cross section of any of its reduced subbundle $B(U,SU(2))\subset B(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ is a global cross section of $B(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ as well. $\Box$

Another way of proving the trivializability of the spin frame bundle over U could be based on Geroch's theorem [15]: by theorem 3.1 U, as a spacetime manifold, admits a globally defined orthonormal tetrad field, and hence it admits a spinor structure in the form of a globally trivializable $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$-spin frame bundle.

Let us fix a spinor structure E on TU and let $\mathbb{S}^A(U)$ be the vector bundle associated to $\tilde{B}(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ with the natural action of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ on $\mathbb{C}^2$. Let ε_{AB} be the symplectic fibre metric thereon inherited through E. By the trivializability of $\tilde{B}(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ the vector bundle of unprimed spinors, $\mathbb{S}^A(U)$, is also globally trivializable. In general, however, the spinor structure E does not necessarily coincide with the restriction to U of the spacetime spinor structure (even if M admits a spinor structure). By the global trivializability of $\mathbb{S}^A(U)$ (or rather of $\tilde{B}(U,SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$) there exist globally defined (normalized) spin frame fields $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ on U. The map E links the global Lorentz and spin frames on U in the standard way: $\sigma_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{A}\underline{A}'}\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{A'}_{\underline{A}'}$ is identified with an orthonormal Lorentz frame field $E^a_{\underline{a}}$ (as it was already done in the introduction in connection with equation (1.2)).

4 The homotopy classes of the Lorentz and spin frame fields on $\mathcal{S}$

Obviously, the theorems of the previous section imply the global trivializability of the pulled back principal bundles $B(\mathcal{S}, SO_0(1,3))$, $\tilde{B}(\mathcal{S}, SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$ and of the vector bundles $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$ to the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$, too; and the number of the inequivalent spinor structures on $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$ is 2^{2g} (for the general notion of a spinor structure on a vector bundle, see e.g. [26]). However, it might be worth noting that since any closed orientable 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ can be triangulated and $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ is arcwise connected and simple connected, any $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ principal bundle over any such $\mathcal{S}$ is always globally trivializable (see §29 of [21]).

In the present section we clarify the homotopy properties of the globally defined basis transformations $E^a_{\underline{a}} \mapsto E^a_{\underline{a}} \Lambda^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{b}}$ and $\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}} \mapsto \mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}} A^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}}$ on the 2-surface, where $\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \to SO_0(1,3)$ and $A : \mathcal{S} \to SL(2,\mathbb{C})$, as maps from $\mathcal{S}$ into the groups in question, are smooth. If $\mathcal{S}$ is homeomorphic to S^2, then the homotopy classes of these transformations define just the second homotopy groups $\pi_2(SO_0(1,3))$ and $\pi_2(SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$, respectively (see [21]), which are well known to be trivial. Next we clarify these homotopy classes on 2-surfaces with $g \geq 1$.

Theorem 4.1 *Any smooth map* $A : \mathcal{S} \to SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ *is homotopic to the identity map* $I : p \mapsto \mathrm{diag}(1,1)$.

Proof: First recall that the homotopy retract of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ is S^3, and hence we should determine the homotopy classes only of the smooth maps $A : \mathcal{S} \to S^3$. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is two dimensional and A is smooth, it cannot be surjective. Thus there is a point $n \in S^3 - A(\mathcal{S})$, and let us introduce the standard polar coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) on $S^3 - \{n\}$ with the 'north pole' at n. If in these coordinates the map A is given by $p \mapsto (r(p), \theta(p), \phi(p))$, then let us define the 1-parameter family of smooth maps $A_t : \mathcal{S} \to S^3$ by $A_t(p) := (t\, r(p), \theta(p), \phi(p))$ for any $t \in [0,1]$. But this is a smooth homotopy between A and the constant map taking all points of $\mathcal{S}$ into the 'south pole' $(0, \mathrm{undetermined}, \mathrm{undetermined})$ of S^3. $\Box$

Therefore, any globally defined gauge transformation $A : \mathcal{S} \to SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ is homotopic to the identity transformation, and hence any such transformation is globally generated by a Lie algebra valued function $a : \mathcal{S} \to sl(2,\mathbb{C})$ via $A^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}} = \exp(a)^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}}$. To clarify the homotopy properties of the Lorentz gauge transformations $\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \to SO_0(1,3)$ too, recall that topologically $SO_0(1,3)$ is $SO(3) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \approx \mathbb{R}P^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$, and hence its fundamental group is $\mathbb{Z}_2$.

Theorem 4.2 *If the genus of* $\mathcal{S}$ *is* g, *then there are precisely* 2^{2g} *homotopically different gauge transformations* $\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \to SO_0(1,3)$.

Proof: Since the homotopy retract of $SO_0(1,3)$ is $SO(3)$, it is enough to prove the statement for pure rotations. Thus let $\Lambda : \mathcal{S} \to SO(3)$ be any given global gauge transformation. If γ is any closed curve in $\mathcal{S}$, then $\Lambda \circ \gamma$ is a closed curve in $SO(3)$, and let us define the index $i_\Lambda(\gamma)$ of γ with respect to Λ to be 1 if $\Lambda \circ \gamma$ is homotopic to zero in $SO(3)$, and to be -1 otherwise. It is easy to see that $i_\Lambda(\gamma) = i_\Lambda(\gamma')$ if γ and γ' are homotopic in $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, since the homotopy class $[\Lambda \circ (\gamma \cdot \gamma')]$ is just the product $[\Lambda \circ \gamma][\Lambda \circ \gamma']$ in $\pi_1(SO(3))$, it follows that $i_\Lambda(\gamma \cdot \gamma') = i_\Lambda(\gamma) i_\Lambda(\gamma')$ for any two closed curves γ and γ' with common endpoints. This implies that the index defines a group homomorphism $i_\Lambda : \pi_1(\mathcal{S}) \to \pi_1(SO(3)) \approx \mathbb{Z}_2$. Next we show that two gauge transformations, say Λ and Λ', are homotopic precisely when $i_\Lambda(\gamma) = i_{\Lambda'}(\gamma)$ for any closed γ.

To see this, suppose first that Λ and Λ' are homotopic; i.e. there is a 1-parameter family of gauge transformations $\Lambda_t : \mathcal{S} \to SO(3)$ such that $\mathcal{S} \times [0,1] \to SO(3) : (p,t) \mapsto \Lambda_t(p)$ is continuous and $\Lambda(p) = \Lambda_0(p)$, $\Lambda'(p) = \Lambda_1(p)$ for any $p \in \mathcal{S}$. Then for any $t \in [0,1]$ and closed curve γ in $\mathcal{S}$ the map $\Lambda_t \circ \gamma : S^1 \to SO(3)$ defines a closed curve in $SO(3)$. Then, however, $\Lambda \circ \gamma$ and $\Lambda' \circ \gamma$ are homotopic in $SO(3)$ with the homotopy $\Lambda_t \circ \gamma$ between them. Therefore, $i_\Lambda(\gamma) = i_{\Lambda'}(\gamma)$.

Conversely, let Λ and Λ' be global gauge transformations such that $i_\Lambda(\gamma) = i_{\Lambda'}(\gamma)$ for any closed curve γ. We will construct a homotopy between Λ and Λ'. Let $p_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ be a point where $\Lambda(p_0) \neq \Lambda'(p_0)$. (We may assume the existence of such a point, because otherwise the two transformations would be the same.) Let $\gamma : S^1 \to \mathcal{S} : s \mapsto \gamma(s)$ be an arbitrary closed curve with the starting and end point $p_0 = \gamma(0) = \gamma(1)$. Then since $i_\Lambda(\gamma) = i_{\Lambda'}(\gamma)$, the closed curves $\Lambda\circ\gamma, \Lambda'\circ\gamma : S^1 \to SO(3)$ are homotopic, and hence there exists a continuous map $\Gamma : S^1 \times [0,1] \to SO(3)$ such that $\Gamma(s,0) = \Lambda\circ\gamma(s)$ and $\Gamma(s,1) = \Lambda'\circ\gamma(s)$ for any $s \in S^1$. In particular, this map defines the continuous curve $t \mapsto \Gamma(0,t)$ in $SO(3)$ from $\Lambda(p_0)$ to $\Lambda'(p_0)$. Then there exists a uniquely determined 1-parameter subgroup $t \mapsto R(p_0,t)$ of $SO(3)$ such that $R(p_0,0) = \mathrm{Id}$, $R(p_0,1) = (\Lambda(p_0))^{-1}\Lambda'(p_0)$ and the curve $\Lambda_t(p_0) := \Lambda(p_0)R(p_0,t)$ between $\Lambda(p_0)$ and $\Lambda'(p_0)$ is homotopic to $t \mapsto \Gamma(0,t)$. (Here $(\Lambda(p_0))^{-1}$ is the inverse of the group element $\Lambda(p_0)$ in $SO(3)$.) However, this $\Lambda_t(p_0)$ can be uniquely extended to a continuous family of curves $\Lambda_t(p)$, $p = \gamma(s)$, joining $\Lambda(p) = \Lambda_0(p)$ to $\Lambda'(p) = \Lambda_1(p)$. Note that this extension to all along γ is globally possible just by the homotopy between $\Lambda \circ \gamma$ and $\Lambda' \circ \gamma$. In fact, $\Lambda_t(\gamma(s))$ is another homotopy (being equivalent to $\Gamma(s,t)$ above), but, apart from its overall orientation, it is completely determined by the two gauge transformations Λ and Λ'. Finally, deforming the closed curve γ throughout $\mathcal{S}$ and composing it with other curves γ' we obtain a continuous map $\Lambda_t : \mathcal{S} \to SO(3)$, $t \in [0,1]$, which defines a homotopy between the gauge transformations Λ and Λ'.

Therefore, there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the homotopy classes of the gauge transformations Λ and the group homomorphisms $i_\Lambda : \pi_1(\mathcal{S}) \to \pi_1(SO(3)) \approx \mathbb{Z}_2$. If $g = 0$, then, as we already saw, there is only one such homotopy class. Thus we may assume that $g \geq 1$. To determine the number of the group homomorphisms i_Λ, let us use the canonical homology basis $\{a_i, b_i\}$, $i = 1, ..., g$, of $\mathcal{S}$. Then i_Λ is characterized completely by the values $i_\Lambda(a_i)$ and $i_\Lambda(b_i)$. Since i_Λ is a homomorphism and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ is commutative, $i_\Lambda(a_i)i_\Lambda(b_i)i_\Lambda(a_i^{-1})i_\Lambda(b_i^{-1})=1$ holds for all $i=1,...,g$, and hence $\prod_{i=1}^g a_i\cdot b_i\cdot a_i^{-1}\cdot b_i^{-1}=1$ does not give any restriction on the values $i_\Lambda(a_i)$ and $i_\Lambda(b_i)$. Hence the number of the homomorphisms $\pi_1(\mathcal{S})\to\mathbb{Z}_2$, i.e. the number of the homotopy classes of the global Lorentz gauge transformations is 2^{2g}. $\Box$

Therefore, in contrast to the $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ transformations, the general Lorentz transformations on a 2-surface with genus $g\geq 1$ cannot be written as $\exp(\lambda)^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{b}}$ for some $\lambda:\mathcal{S}\to so(1,3)$, because these are all homotopic to the identity transformation (the homotopy is $\exp(t\,\lambda)$, $t\in[0,1]$). Consequently, a general Lorentz gauge transformation necessarily has the form $\exp(\lambda)^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{b}}\Lambda^{\underline{b}}_{(k)\underline{c}}$, where $\Lambda^{\underline{a}}_{(k)\underline{b}}$, $k=1,...,2^{2g}$, are fixed gauge transformations with different homotopy classes. (Of course, one of them can be chosen to be the identity transformation.)

Since the number of the different spinor structures and the number of the homotopy classes of the Lorentz gauge transformations is 2^{2g} for any g, one might conjecture that there is a deeper connection between the $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ spinor structures and the homotopy classes of the Lorentz gauge transformations. The next theorem states that this expectation is correct.

Theorem 4.3 *There is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the spinor structures on $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$ and the homotopy classes of the global orthonormal frame fields in $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$.*

Proof: Let $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ be a normalized spin frame in a given spinor structure, and let $A:\mathcal{S}\to SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ be any spin gauge transformation. By Theorem 4.1 this is homotopic to the identity transformation, and hence there is a 1-parameter family of $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ transformations, $A_t:\mathcal{S}\to SL(2,\mathbb{C})$, $t\in[0,1]$, such that $A_0(p)=\mathrm{diag}\,(1,1)$ and $A_1(p)=A(p)$ at every $p\in\mathcal{S}$. Then, however, the corresponding Lorentz gauge transformation, $\Lambda^{\underline{a}}_t{}_{\underline{b}}:=\sigma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{A}\,\underline{A}'}A^{\underline{A}}_t{}_{\underline{B}}\bar{A}^{\underline{A}'}_t{}_{\underline{B}'}\sigma^{\underline{B}\,\underline{B}'}_{\underline{b}}$, is a homotopy between $\Lambda^{\underline{a}}_1{}_{\underline{b}}$ and the identity transformation. Therefore, the spinor structure with any spin frame $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ determines the homotopy class of the orthonormal Lorentz frame field $E^a_{\underline{a}}:=\sigma^{\underline{A}\,\underline{A}'}_{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{A'}_{\underline{A}'}$.

Conversely, suppose that the Lorentz frames determined by the normalized spin frames $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ are homotopic. Then, however, we can always find a gauge transformation $A:\mathcal{S}\to SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ such that $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^A_{\underline{A}}A^{\underline{A}}{}_{\underline{B}}\}$ determine the same Lorentz frame. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ define the *same* Lorentz frame, and hence $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^A_{\underline{A}}=\pm\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}$. However, $\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}$ and $-\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}$ are homotopic spin frames, and hence they belong to the same spinor structure. Therefore, the correspondence between the spinor structures and the homotopy classes of the Lorentz frames is indeed one-to-one. $\Box$

In particular, there are four homotopically different global frame fields and four different spinor structures on the Lorentzian vector bundle $\mathbb{V}^a(\mathcal{S})$ over a torus $\mathcal{S}\approx S^1\times S^1$. To see them, let $\mathcal{S}$ be a standard torus of radii R and r, given explicitly by $t=0$, $x=(R+r\cos\phi)\cos\Phi$, $y=(R+r\cos\phi)\sin\Phi$ and

$z=r\sin\phi$, $R>r>0$, in the Cartesian coordinates of the Minkowski spacetime. Then one frame field can be the restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ of the constant Cartesian frame field $\{E^a_{\underline{a}}\}:=\{(\frac{\partial}{\partial t})^a,...,(\frac{\partial}{\partial z})^a\}$. The vectors of the second may be $e^a_0:=E^a_0$, $e^a_1:=\frac{1}{R+r\cos\phi}(\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi})^a$, $e^a_2:=\frac{1}{r}(\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi})^a$ and $e^a_3:=\varepsilon^a{}_{bcd}e^b_0e^c_1e^d_2$. Then the spatial basis vectors of these frames are connected with each other by

$$\begin{aligned} e^a_1&=-\sin(\Phi)E^a_1+\cos(\Phi)E^a_2,\\ e^a_2&=-\sin(\phi)\cos(\Phi)E^a_1-\sin(\phi)\sin(\Phi)E^a_2+\cos(\phi)E^a_3,\\ e^a_3&=\cos(\phi)\cos(\Phi)E^a_1+\cos(\phi)\sin(\Phi)E^a_2+\sin(\phi)E^a_3.\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

For the third and the fourth frames we choose $\tilde e^a_{\underline{a}}:=(e^a_0,\tilde e^a_1,\tilde e^a_2,e^a_3)$ and $\tilde{\tilde e}^a_{\underline{a}}:=(e^a_0,\tilde{\tilde e}^a_1,\tilde{\tilde e}^a_2,e^a_3)$, respectively, where

$$\tilde e^a_1:=\cos(\Phi)e^a_1+\sin(\Phi)e^a_2,\qquad \tilde e^a_2:=-\sin(\Phi)e^a_1+\cos(\Phi)e^a_2;\tag{4.2}$$

$$\tilde{\tilde e}^a_1:=\cos(\phi)e^a_1+\sin(\phi)e^a_2,\qquad \tilde{\tilde e}^a_2:=-\sin(\phi)e^a_1+\cos(\phi)e^a_2.\tag{4.3}$$

In the Cartesian coordinates for the canonical homology basis we choose the curves $a(\Phi):=(0,R\cos(\Phi),R\sin(\Phi),r)$ and $b(\phi):=(0,R+r\cos(\phi),0,r\sin(\phi))$. Then by (4.1) the basis $\{e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ undergoes a complete 2π rotation with respect to $\{E^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ in the 2-planes spanned by E^a_1 and E^a_2, and in the 2-planes spanned by E^a_1 and E^a_3 along the curves a and b, respectively. Similarly, by (4.2) the frame $\{\tilde e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ undergoes a 2π rotation with respect to $\{e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ along a, but remains unrotated along b; while $\{\tilde{\tilde e}^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ is rotated with respect to $\{e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ along b, but remains unrotated along a. Thus, denoting the Lorentz matrices corresponding to (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3), respectively, by Λ, $\tilde\Lambda$ and $\tilde{\tilde\Lambda}$, for the index of the closed curves a and b we obtain that $i_\Lambda(a)=i_\Lambda(b)=-1$, $i_{\tilde\Lambda}(a)=-i_{\tilde\Lambda}(b)=-1$ and $i_{\tilde{\tilde\Lambda}}(a)=-i_{\tilde{\tilde\Lambda}}(b)=1$, indicating that no two of the four Lorentz frames above are homotopic.

It is easy to see that the spin frames $\{\mathcal{E}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$, $\{\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}}\}$, $\{\tilde\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\tilde\varepsilon}^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ corresponding to the Lorentz frames $\{E^a_{\underline{a}}\}$, $\{e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$, $\{\tilde e^a_{\underline{a}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\tilde e}^a_{\underline{a}}\}$, respectively, belong to different spinor structures. For example, if, on the contrary, we assume that $\{\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ and $\{\tilde\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}}\}$ belong to the same spinor structure, then these spin frames would have to be connected by a globally defined $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ transformation $\tilde A$. Apart from an overall sign, this would be fixed by (4.2), and would be given by $\mathrm{diag}(\exp(\frac{i}{2}\Phi),\exp(-\frac{i}{2}\Phi))$, yielding at the common starting and end point $a(0)=a(2\pi)$ of the closed curve a that $\tilde\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}}(a(0))=-\tilde\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}}(a(2\pi))$.

The author is grateful to the referees for their valuable remarks and useful criticism. This work was partially supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) grants T042531 and K67790.

References

[1] L. B. Szabados, Quasi-local energy-momentum and angular momentum in GR: A review article, Living Rev. Relativity, **7** (2004) 4, `http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2004-4`

[2] C. Møller, Conservation laws and absolute parallelism in general relativity, Mat. Fis. Skr. Dan. Vid. Selsk. **1** No 10, pp 1–50 (1961)

[3] J. N. Goldberg, Invariant transformations, conservation laws, and energy-momentum, in *General Relativity and Gravitation*, vol. 1, pp. 469–489, Ed. A. Held, Plenum Press, New York, 1980

[4] R. Aldrovandi, J. G. Pereira, *An introduction to teleparallel gravity*, Lecture notes Universidad de Concepcion, 2005, Instituto de Fisica Teorica, UNESP Sao Paulo preprint, `http://www.ift.unesp.br/gcg/tele.pdf`

[5] G. A. J. Sparling, Twistors, spinors and the Einstein vacuum equations, in *Further Advances in Twistor Theory III: Curved Twistor Spaces*, Eds.: L. J. Mason, L. P. Hughston, P. Z. Kabak and K. Pulverer; Chapman and Hall 2001, pp. 179–187

[6] J. M. Nester, A positive gravitational energy proof, Phys. Lett. A **139** 112–114 (1989)

[7] J. M. Nester, Positive energy via the teleparallel Hamiltonian, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **4** 1755–1772 (1989)

[8] L. B. Szabados, Canonical pseudotensors, Sparling's form and Noether currents, KFKI Report 1991-29/B, `http://www.rmki.kfki.hu∼lbszab`

[9] L. B. Szabados, On canonical pseudotensors, Sparling's form and Noether currents, Class. Quantum Grav. **9** 2521–2541 (1992)

[10] V. C. de Andrade, L. C. T. Guillen, J. G. Pereira, Gravitational energy-momentum density in teleparallel gravity, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** 4533-4536 (2000), gr-qc/0003100

[11] Y. N. Obukhov, G. F. Rubilar, Covariance properties and regularization of conserved currents in tetrad gravity, Phys. Rev. D **73** 124017–1-14 (2006), gr-qc/0605045

[12] Y. Itin, Coframe geometry and gravity, arXiv:0711.4209 [gr-qc]

[13] L. J. Mason, J. Frauendiener, The Sparling 3-form, Ashtekar variables and quasi-local mass, in *Twistors in Mathematics and Physics*, ed. R. Baston and T. Bailey, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, pp. 189–217, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1990

[14] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime*, vol 1, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1982

[15] R. Geroch, Spinor structure of spacetimes in general relativity, I, J. Math. Phys. **9** 1739-1744 (1968)

[16] J. Milnor, Spin structures on manifolds, L'Enseignement Math. **9** 198-203 (1963)

[17] K. Bichteler, Global existence of spin structures for gravitational fields, J. Math. Phys. **9** 813-815 (1968)

[18] R. Geroch, Spinor structure of spacetimes in general relativity, II, J. Math. Phys. **11** 343-348 (1970)

[19] R. Penrose, The structure of spacetime, in *Battelle Rencontres in Mathematics and Physics*, Eds. C. DeWitt and J. A. Wheeler, W. A. Benjamin Inc, New York 1968

[20] S. Kobayashi, K. Nomizu, *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, vol. 1 and vol 2, Interscience, New York, 1964 and 1968

[21] N. Steenrod, *The Topology of Fibre Bundles*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1951

[22] L. Alvarez-Gaumé, P. Nelson, Riemann surfaces and string theories, CERN-TH.4615/86 preprint

[23] J. Frauendiener, L. B. Szabados, The kernel of the edth operators on higher-genus spacelike two-surfaces, Class. Quantum Grav. **18** 1003–1014 (2001), gr-qc/0010089

[24] P. E. Parker, On some theorems of Geroch and Stiefel, J. Math. Phys. **25** 597–599 (1984)

[25] J. W. Morgan, An introduction to gauge theories, in *Gauge Theory and the Topology of Four-Manifolds*, (IAS/Park City Mathematics Series vol 4, Ed. R. Friedman and J. W. Morgan, AMS, Providence, RI, 1998, pp. 53–143

[26] H. B. Lawson, M.-L. Michelsohn, *Spin Geometry*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton 1989